

REMARKS

Claims 1-16 were previously canceled; claims 17 – 20, 25 – 27, and 29 have been amended herein. Support for these amendments can be found, for example, in paragraphs [00029], [00046], [00049], and FIG. 1. No new claims have been added by way of this response. No claims have been canceled by way of this response. Thus, claims 17 - 37 are currently pending and presented for examination. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of the pending claims in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Response to Rejections Under Section 101:

The Examiner rejected claim 17 under 35 USC 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claim 17, as amended, includes, for example, “a data link” (i.e., a physical part of the system), thereby qualifying as statutory subject matter under Section 101. Should the Examiner determine that the claims still define subject matter that is not statutory, Applicant requests the Examiner to identify the features of the invention that would render the claimed subject matter statutory, as provided for by M.P.E.P. 2106, in the next action.

Response to Rejections Under Section 103:

The Examiner rejects Claims 17 – 37 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Collier* (US Patent No. 7,299,209) in view of *Frison et al.* (US Patent No. 6,049,789). Independent claims 17 and 25 have been amended as set forth in the above listing of claims. Essentially, the claims are amended to specify that the plurality handlers are of *different types* to receive keys of *different types*, respectively, and that these handlers are connected to a single license key handler manager, thereby providing one interface for a user for license enabling for software programs which require a specific *type* of key, rather than having to interface with numerous handlers for each software program.

Specifically, Claim 17, as amended recites:

“...a plurality of license key handlers of different types for receiving a license keys of different types, respectively; and
a license key handler manager connected by a data link to each license key handler to exchange data with each license key handler, said license key manager thereby providing one interface for a user for license enabling for software programs.”

Similarly, Claim 25, as amended recites:

“...providing at least first and second license key handlers of different types for receiving a license keys of different types, respectively;
connecting the first and second license handlers to a license key handler manager, said license key manager thereby providing one interface for a user for license enabling for software programs...”

Neither *Collier* nor *Frison* alone or in combination teach or suggest this requirement of Applicant's amended claims 17 and 25, namely that there are license key handlers of different types for receiving a license keys of different types, respectively. Specifically, *Collier* describes a license key LK which is combined with a content key CK forming a pair of keys to encrypt and decrypt content (of a single type). There are no handlers of “different types” for receiving license keys of “different types” managed by a single handler manager. In fact, the keys of *Collier* are essentially a pair of keys designed to work together to provide a second level of security when delivering material (of a single type) to the end user. It does not disclose different handlers for different types of keys for different types of programs all managed by a single manager as in the claims.

Moreover, *Frison* fails to remedy the shortcomings of *Collier*. Specifically, *Frison* describes a pay-per-use (PPU) scheme wherein all of the licenses are of the *same type*, namely PPU licenses. It therefore does not need or utilize handlers of “different types” for receiving license keys of “different types”.

Accordingly, none of the cited prior teaches handlers of “different types” for receiving license keys of “different types” managed by a single handler manager, especially since both references actually deal with only one type of “key” and/or license.

In view of the foregoing and the amended claims, Applicant respectfully submits that *Collier* in view of *Frison* does not disclose or suggest all features of amended Claims 17 and 25. Therefore, *Collier* in view of *Frison* does not render Claims 17 and 25 obvious. Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to reconsider the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) and to pass independent Claims 17 and 25 to allowance.

Claims 18 - 24 and 26 - 37 depend from Claims 17 and 25, respectively. These dependent claims recite additional inventive features that are in combination with the features of the respective independent claim not disclosed or suggested by the cited references. The above arguments regarding Claims 17 and 25 are repeated herewith. Each one of these dependent claims is, therefore, on its own patentable. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully requests the Examiner to reconsider and to withdraw the instant rejections and to pass Claims 18 - 24 and 26 - 37 to allowance.

(Please proceed to the next page.)

Serial No. 10/563,476
Atty. Doc. No. 2003P09061WOUS


Conclusion

Accordingly, Applicant submits that all claims are in condition for allowance and request that a Notice of Allowance be issued. The commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any appropriate fees due in connection with this paper, including the fees specified in 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 (c), 1.17(a)(1) and 1.20(d), or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 19-2179.

Respectfully submitted,

By:

Dated: 10/30/08



John P. Musone
Registration No. 44,961
Tel: (407) 736 6449

Siemens Corporation
Intellectual Property Department
170 Wood Avenue South
Iselin, New Jersey 08830